

Appl. No.: 10/077,927
Docket No.: 1248-0578P
Reply to final Office Action of April 1, 2004

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11, 12 and 14-18 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, 12, 17 and 18 are independent claims. By this amendment, claims 1, 11, 12, 17 and 18 are amended and claims 3 and 13 are canceled. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Entry of the amendment is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendment:

(a) places the application in condition for allowance (for reasons discussed herein); (b) do not raise new issue requiring further search and/or consideration **(since the amendment merely incorporates dependent claims 3 (13) into the independent claims)**; (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and/or (e) places the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. Entry of the amendment is thus respectfully requested.

The Claims Satisfy The Requirements Of
35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd Paragraph

The Office Action reject claims 1-9 and 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to claim 1, 11 and 12 obviates the rejection of claim 1-9 and 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph. In particular, the amended claims 1, 11 and 12 recite --only through both sides in a width direction--.

As such, applicants respectfully submit that the amended claim clarify the limitations recited therein.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-9 and 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph is respectfully solicited.

The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The office action recites the following rejections: (1) claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,172,730 to Fujita (hereafter Fujita); (2) claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita in view of applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA); and (3) claims 1-9 and 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,211,936 to Nakamura in view of Fujita.

These rejections and objection are respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that Fujita, either alone or in combination with Nakamura and/or AAPA, fails to teach or suggest each and every feature as set forth in the claimed invention.

One aspect of the present invention is to provide a display module and the like whereby, in a flexible wire board, a short circuit in a wire pattern can be prevented, and a break in the wire pattern when bent can be suppressed. Thus, a superior reliability can be realized. In order to attain the foregoing object, the display module of the present invention includes the following features: "the insulating protective layer of the flexible wire board is extended inside the display panel only through both sides

in a width direction of the flexible wire board while having the flexible wire board connected to the display panel, and the anisotropic conductive adhesive is extended to protrude from the display panel."

The Claims Fail to be Anticipated by Fujita

In contrast to the present invention, applicants respectfully submit that Fujita fails to disclose the combination of arrangements wherein "the insulating protective layer of the flexible wire pattern is extended inside the display panel only through both sides in a width direction of the flexible wire board.. while having the flexible wire board connected to the display panel" and "the anisotropic conductive adhesive being extended to protrude from the display panel". With the claimed arrangement, the occurrence of a break in the wire pattern is efficiently suppressed. Moreover, the claimed arrangement prevents a leak or the like which can be caused by the adhesion of dirt, and prevents the flexible wire board from peeling off of the display panel. (see for example, applicants' specification, page 24, line 16 to page 25, line 12).

According to MPEP §2131, "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ...claims." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be

arranged as required by the claims, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. In *re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has failed to establish the required *prima facie* case of anticipation because the cited reference, Fujita, fails to teach or suggest each and every feature as set forth in the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 18 is allowable over Fujita for at least the reasons noted above.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully solicited.

The Claims Fail to be Obvious over Fujita/Nakamura/AAPA

Applicants also respectfully submit that both AAPA and Nakamura fail to make up for the deficiencies noted above found in Fujita.

Specifically, like Fujita, both AAPA and Nakamura also fail to teach or suggest the combination of arrangements wherein "the insulating protective layer of the flexible wire pattern is extended inside the display panel only through both sides in a width direction of the flexible wire board... while having the flexible wire board connected to the display panel" and "the anisotropic conductive adhesive being extended to protrude from the display panel".

In contrast to the anisotropic conductive adhesive of present invention, the support element 31 disclosed in Nakamura is merely provided for making it easy to bend the "FPC 5" and fails to be an "anisotropic conductive adhesive".

To establish a *prima facie* case of Obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See MPEP 706.02(j).

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Nakamura and Fujita and/or the combination of Fujita with AAPA each fail to teach or suggest each and every feature as set forth in the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that not only does the references fail to teach or suggest each and every feature as set forth in the claimed invention, but that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine/modify the teachings of Fujita with Nakamura or AAPA because there is no teaching or suggestion in any of the references regarding how or why one would modify such systems to arrive at the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 11, 12 and 17 are allowable over the combination of Fujita with Nakamura and/or AAPA for at least the reasons noted above.

Appl. No.: 10/077,927
Docket No.: 1248-0578P
Reply to final Office Action of April 1, 2004

As for each of the dependent claims not particularly discussed above, these claims are also allowable for at least the reasons set forth above regarding their corresponding independent claims, and/or for the further features claimed therein.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-9 and 11-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Carolyn T. Baumgardner (Reg. No. 41,345) at (703) 205-8000 to schedule a Personal Interview.

Appl. No.: 10/077,927
Docket No.: 1248-0578P
Reply to final Office Action of April 1, 2004

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment from or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. §1.17; particularly, the extension of time fees.


Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASH & BIRCH, LLP

By


Charles Gorenstein, #29,271

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000


CG/CTB:ctb/mpe
1248-0578P